

Appl. No. 10/098,581
Atty Docket No. 8885
Response dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated June 29, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 6, 7, 10, 17, 19 and 27 are now in the case.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 20-26 and 28-33 have been canceled. Applicants have amended claim 19 to incorporate some of the limitations of original claim 18. Applicants have amended claim 27 to incorporate the limitations of original claim 28. Claims 6, 7, 10 and 17 have been amended to correct dependencies.

Response to the Office Action

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Huffman et al

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-17, 19, 20, 22-24 and 27-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,887,118 issued to Huffman et al (hereinafter "Huffman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Amended Claim 19 (amended herewith to incorporate some of the limitations of Claim 18) is not anticipated by Huffman. Claim 19 now requires at least two choices of volatile material-specific emission modes, and at least two of the emission modes differ in at least one of the following parameters: (a) speed at which a fan that disperses the volatile material operates; (b) duration of operation of a fan; and (c) intervals between operation of a fan. Huffman does not teach or suggest emission modes. Huffman does not disclose the device claimed by Applicants.

In addition, independent Claim 27 (amended herewith to incorporate the limitations of Claim 28) is not anticipated by Huffman. Huffman does not disclose a system wherein the scented material is released in at least one of the following manners: random bursts of scented material; the gradual increase or decrease in concentration through the duration of emission; and the intentional drop in concentration below sensory limits. Huffman does not discuss any of these manners of release. Therefore, the reference cannot anticipate Applicants' claims 6, 7, 10, 17, 19 and 27, as indicated in the Office Action.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Chiao

Appl. No. 10/098,581
Atty Docket No. 8885
Response dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated June 29, 2005

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 16, 18, 21, 25, 26 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,654,664 B1 issued to Chiao (hereinafter "Chiao"). Since these claims have been canceled, Applicants respectfully contend that this rejection is moot.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Boyd et al

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,737,025 issued to Boyd et al (hereinafter "Boyd"). Since this claim has been canceled, Applicants respectfully contend that this rejection is moot.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Chiao


Claims 32 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiao. Since these claims have been canceled, Applicants respectfully contend that this rejection is moot.

Conclusion

It is submitted that Claims 6, 7, 10, 17, 19 and 27 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action on all claims is therefore requested.

If the next action is other than to allow the claims, the favor of a telephonic interview is requested with the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank Andrej Kvietok et al.

By 
Brent M. Peebles
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,576
(513) 627-6773

November 29, 2005
Customer No. 27752